



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/618,149	07/10/2003	Marc M. Jalisi	ACS 64748 (1331P2D2)	4067
22852	7590	07/27/2006	EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413				HO, UYEN T
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		3731		

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/618,149	JALISI, MARC M.
	Examiner (Jackie) Tan-Uyen T. Ho	Art Unit 3731

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 May 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 39-59 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 39-59 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 5/12/06 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 39-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Examiner is not clear to which subject matter applicant regards as the invention. Claim 39, the preamble calls for an apparatus. However, the body of the claim recites the steps of making a stent from a substrate tube comprising three layers. In claim 39, applicant claimed both an intermediate product as a substrate tube having two cladding layers as well as a final product as stent being made from the intermediate product.

For the purpose of art rejection, examiner considers claims 39-59 are not limited to the steps or intermediate materials as recited but only the structure of the final product over the prior art.

Terminal Disclaimer

4. The terminal disclaimer filed on 11/28/05 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 39-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klein et al. (5,922,020) in view of Armini (5,919,126). Klein et al. disclose a stent being made from either stainless steel but suggest it can be made from superelastic, shape memory alloy (col. 5, lines 40-47) and the stent having a plurality of radially expandable cylindrical elements and interconnected by elements disposed between and the stent being plated with radiopaque materials (col. 10, lines 30-45). Although, Klein et al. do not disclose an adhesive layer to adhere the radiopaque layer to the substrate of the stent. It is well known in the art to provide an adhesive layer between a metal or alloy substrate and radiopaque layer in order to enhance the adherence. Armini taught an adhesive layer between radiopaque layer and a metal substrate. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make a superelastic stent as suggest by Klein et al. and employ an adhesive layer in view of Armini into the stent as suggested by Klein et al. in order to have better radiopaque self deploying prostheses.

Regarding claims 45-47, although the combined teach of Klein et al. and Armini does not disclose the materials as claimed, the materials as claimed are well known material in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to substitute one material for the an other within the same art and it would perform equally well in the stent of Klein et al. in view of Armini

Regarding claims 56-58, the patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. *In re Pilkington*, 411 F.2d 1345, 1348, 162 USPQ 145, 147 (CCPA 1969). If the product in a product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. *In re Marosi*, 710 F.2d 799, 803, 218 USPQ 289, 292-93 (Fed. Cir. 1983)., *Johnson & Johnson v. W.L. Gore*, 436 F.supp. 704, 726, 195 USPQ 487, 506 (D. Del. 1977)., see also *In re Fessman*, 489 F.2d 742, 180 USPQ 324 (CCPA 1974). In this case the product of the Klein et al. in view of Armini is a stent having three layers, a superelastic alloy substrate tube, a first metallic layer and a second metallic radiopaque layer and the stent pattern including a plurality of cylindrical elements and interconnecting elements.

Regarding the length as claimed, it is well known in the art that a stent has the length as claimed to accommodate and support the vessel including a treated area within that that range. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the Klein et al. in view of skill in the art at the Armini' stent having the length as claimed in order to support a treated area with that range.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to (Jackie) Tan-Uyen T. Ho whose telephone number is 571-272-4696. The examiner can normally be reached on MULTIFLEX Mon. to Sat..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, ANHTUAN NGUYEN can be reached on 571-272-4963. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



(Jackie) Tan-Uyen T. Ho
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3731

July 23 2006